SOME NEW HOOKS. The Higher Critteiam of the Bible.

As accurrences but not unknown writer, who has been for a dozen years a elergrican in the Protestant Episcopal Church, has set forth In two books, respectively entitled Ancient Bacred Scriptures and Remascent Christianity, what he believes to be the sutcome of the higher criticism of the hible and of the study of comparative religion. In the second of these volumes an attempt is made to offer a forceast of what the Christian religion will be, or will begin to be, before the imenticth century has expired. The first volume contains selectionfrom the Scriptures of many nations, including not only the Old and the New Testament, but elso the sacred writings of the Egyptians, the Chinese, the Persians, the Hindus, the Ruddhists, and the Arabians, together with extracts from such ethical or philosophical writings of the Greeks as seem to deserve to be invested with a certain sanctify. For some reason which we do not understand, the author gives many quotations from Epictetus, as if he were an exampiar of Roman Seclutures. As a matter of fact. Epictetus was born and duct in a Greekspeaking country, although he spent a large part of his middle life in Italy. He taught orally in Greek, and his discourses were taken down in Greek. It was Greek ethics and Greek philosophy of which he was an expounder.

We would here repeat what we said at the beginning of a former article, that our purpose in examining these and other books that deal with the higher criticism of the Bible is not to justify them or to condemn them, but merely to elicit information. We simply aim to show, and, as far as possible, to exhibit in their own language, what it is that, as they assert, has been proven or rendered probable, through the application of the methods and apparatus of modern scholarship to the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. On the mode, indeed, of interpreting the Old Teatament we have previously dwelt length in a notice of Dr. Briggs's book "The Study of the Holy Bible," and, therefore, in the two books now before us we shall confine ourselves mainly to what the author has to say soncerning the New Testament. This can be fairly well exemplified by excerpts from the to the "Ancient Sacred Scriptures and by the answers given on pages 58-34 of "Renascent Christianity" to questions often put by orthodox theologians.

In the general preface to the selections which he has made from the New Testament, the author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures" invites us to remember that the biographies of Jesus, or the Gospels, as they are called, were none of them written until long after the death of Jeaus. Not one of His words was written down when speken, or, indeed, written in any form, until many years after it was spoken. So profound, however, was the im-pression made by His words upon the minds and memories of those who heard them, and especially upon His disciples, that, after His tragic death, they were visibly recalled. and, in fragmentary form, passed from mouth to mouth and circulated from place to place, wherever His persecuted followers were scattered abroad or went preaching the new religion. Thus it came to pass that, for many years, the words as well as the deeds of Jesus were preserved only as traditions. Repeated over and over thousands of times by thousands of different persons, and among unlearned and superstitious people, it was im-possible, our author submits, that they should e preserved, even for a brief period, in their exact original form; much less could they be so preserved and transported to a second or a third generation. Hence, as a matter of necessity, various mythical or fabulous interweavings of attempted explanation, elaboration, inference and detail must have taken place. during the quarter century or more which elapsed between the death of Jesus and even the first written record of His life. These in terweavings of fancy and fable increased so rapidly, and threatened so completely to obscure the original words and deeds around which they had grown, that, at length, devout men set themselves to work to collect from the mass of floating traditions such as they deemed most trustworthy, in order to write them down and so preserve them from further accretions of extravagance and injeconception. In such an attempt even the most h elear-minded and conscientions biographers. with no scrap of written record or history be fore them and depending entirely upon oral reports and testimony, must have been able to gather only a very importeet, fragmentary, and, in detail, untrustworthy account of words that had been sticken that had been performed more than a generation before their time. Hence the conclusion is drawn that the exact words and precise deeds of Jesus are not, and never can be, known. The spirit of them, on the other hand, unquestionably survives, and shines luminously forth from the pages of the four Gospels. What the author of the book before us would have all wise persons do is to consider this

apirit, which "maketh alive" and not the let-Elsewhere in the preface it is pointed out that the four toosiels were none of them composed before the atter half of the first century. and in their present form were not known until the beginning of the third century. The titles "Matthew." "Mark." "Luke" and "John" are probably only the assumed names under which has was then common and allowable) their unknown authors or compilers wrote. It is pronounced possible, and even probable, that they are all different versions of an original collection or gospel made long beore by some one of the disciples or apostles of Jesus. Upon this theory their agreements and disagreements may be accounted for, while at the same time the careful student of the ints of likeness and unlikeness may disentangle the four parratives and weave their materials again into one connected and consistent account of all that is most permamently important in the life and teachings of Jesus. This is what the author has attempted in that part of the "Ancient Sacred Scriptures" which is devoted to the New Testament. But, before marking the principles upon which his selections have been made, we should note what he says about John's tinspel and about the mode of translating certain physics to which a epecial significance has been attached, It is well known that the computer of the fourth Gospel-it is immaterial whether a regard the name of John as real or assume. It relixed to his biography of Jesus a metal in successive more processing. introduction, commencing with "In the begin-ning was the Logos," Ac. This Logos doctrine, as it has since come to be called, is not in any way referred to in any other portion of the New Testament, and from the viewpoint of the higher criticism is booked upon as a subtlets borrowed originally from the Greek, schools of philosophy. The author of the fourth Gospel also mided frequently to his account of what Jesus said and did philosoph. ical opinions of his own, which not only are not confirmed by the records of the authors of the other three, or so-called synoptic gastels. but are out of harmony with them. He has also added incidents not mentioned by any of the other biographers. Passing now to the phrases "Bon of Man " and "Son of God, " which occur in the Gospels, and upon which great stress has en laid by theologians, the author of "Anelent Sacred Scriptures" points out that in the Hebrew writings these phrases are Inequently found, especially in the later or propher e po-They are used interchangeably, and asaquivalents, with the common understanding, apparently, that they were both titles which all good men might assume or have applied to It was especially, however, men of disand called themselves by these terms. When, therefore, Jesus appeared, calling himself and being called "Son of Man" and "Son of God." it was no novelty; it was in keeping with the common speech of the Hebrews as applied to all whom they looked upon as sages or prophets. Recognizing this to be the fact, the pres-

ent translator has departed from the cus-

In large letters when applied to Jesus, and In small or ordinary letters when applied to other persons; he has used the same form of letters all cases, to whomspever, either in the Hebrew or Christian Scriptures, the term son of man or son of God are applied. As a matter of fact, in the tircek text, these terms are invariably printed in an impartial form of letters, not only in the Gospel narratives, but throughout the other portions of the New Testament In the Greek texts, also, such terms as "Lord," "Messiah," "King," Ac, which, when applied to Jesus, now ordinarily begin with a capital letter, were printed with an impartial form of letters whether the terms were applied to Jesus or to any other human being.

We will now proceed to indicate the prin-

Scriptures" has made his selections from the

tells us, to assist in the discornment of the spirit, as separated from the letter. To that nel it has seemed to him needful to remove from the Gospels all evident accretions of myth. fable or extravagance, and, at the same time, to omit these details of explanation and history which have no direct bearing upon practical religious instruction, inspiration and life. Genealogy, Old Testament quotations, ac counts of physical boxlings or wonder-workings, the explanations of those who claimed to be everythesses, and the doctrinal opinions of those who professed to be the compilers of the narratives now found in the New Testament: all these things, it is submitted, have only, at most an intellectual value, and, whether true or false, should find no place in a religious book designed for the practical instruction and inspiration of the Church, the Sunday school and the home. Inasmuch, therefore, as the present selections from the Gospel are designed for immediate and practical uses, in pulpit and pew, in the closet and at the family itar, all details have been studiously excluded that fall directly under any of the five following heads: First, the genealogy and miraculous birth of Jesus, together with his bodily resurrection and baddy ascension into heaven, concerning all of which but little is said in the New Testament, and that little seems to be contradictory, untrustworthy and practically unimportant; secondly, the wonders and so-called miracles which He is reported to have wronght, which reports, whether true or false, have no essential bearings upon Jesus as an example whom we ought to follow and a teacher whose work we ought to love and obey; thirdly, those citations from the Old Testament which are commonly looked upon as "fulfilment of prophecy," but which, whether received as natural or supernatural, imaginary or real coincidences, neither add to nor detract from the beautiful character and sublime teachings of Jesus; fourthly, the personal opinions, nferences and explanations of the compilers of the Gospels themselves, none of whom professes to have been an eyewitness of the deeds or a hearer of the words of Jesus, but simply one of those to whom the traditions "were delivered:" lastly, such unimportant elaborations as the details concerning sick persons healed, insane persons restored, the hungry provided with food, &c., from which, except by strained and unnatural interpretations, no practical ns of morality and religion can be In the preface to selections from the Acts of the Apostles, and from the Apostolic Letters, further light is thrown upon the methods of exposition followed writer of the book before us and other representatives of the higher criticism. It is inted out with regard to the Acts that the authorship of this book, like that of the Four Gospels, is uncertain. It is commonly supposed to have been written by the person who, under the name of "Luke," wrote the Third Gospel. Like the four evangelical narratives. it is made up of historic fragments interwoven with traditional elaborations and details. Especially is this the case with the first few chapters, in which are recorded events which transpired at least a whole generation before the book was composed. During all this time, and | main inside as long as free interpretation and possibly for three or four generations, the remembrances of these events were floating from mouth to mouth and from place to place In an unwritten form; hence it is prosunced impossible that they should have teen preserved from sundry accretions of myth and fable, especially as those who hear I and repeated them were unlearned peothe to whom fanciful ideas and exaggerations things?" The answer is given it the words of of facts were as natural as the air they breathed. Exactly when the Book of Acts was composed is not known. The first mention of it, or quota-

we are told, the object of the compiler. The Apostolic Letters are acknowledged by the author of the book before us, as by almost all other students, to be the oldest of all Chris tian writings. They are undoubtedly letters which were originally written by absent pastors to their various churches, and were designed to be read in public to the members of those churches for their instruction and ediffcation. Of such letters a great many were written; only the more important of them were preserved by those to whom they were addressed. Most even of those preserved as important contained so little of general instruction or interest that when the collection which now constitutes the Epistles of the New Testament was made up they were not deemed orthy of preservation. So it has come to pass that the twenty-one letters now found in the New Testament, together with the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles and the Revelaon have come down to us simply as the survivals of the fittest out of that mass of early bristian writings to which the writer of the Fourth Gospel might have applied his remark : I suppose that even the world itself could not have contained the books." Of the twenty-one stters now embraced in the New Testament, four namely, that to the Hebrews, the second Peter, the second and third of John, were ing repudiated by many as spurious and unmany competent and fair-minded investigaers to be, in common with some of the shorter etters attributed to St. Paul, the production of those whose names are appended to them, but of some unknown persons writing under assumed names, a practice which at the time was allowable and common. The author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures," however, is convinced that all of the New Testament leters, with the execution of the Epistle to Philemen in the Second and Phird Epistles of John, are valuable, by whomsoever written, Even the Letter to the Hebrews, so frequently and persistently decried, proves, in his judgment, when properly translated and apprehended, to be one of the most structive and inspiring portions of the Oristian Scripture. Of the letters to the Homans, Corinthians, Unlatians, Ephesians,

tions from it, of which we have record occurred

in the latter part of the second century. Dur-ing the third and fourth centuries it was re-

pected by many students as spurious and

been held by some modern theologians. The author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures," how-

vein of trustworthy and valuable historical

facts running through the stratum which is

known as the Acts of the Apostles. To find

and to follow this vein and to make from it

such selections as promise to have a vital bear-

ing upon religious thoughts and lives has been.

New Testament writings whose real author hip is, with some degree of certainty, known. exceedingly probable, as also the fact that they are the oldest of all Christian Scriptures which have been handed down to us. The about A. D. 60, and the other letters of St. Paul at about the same date. With regard to the tinguished virtue or wisdom who were called tirred in which these existles were originally penned, we are invited to observe that nowhere in the whole range of literature, ancient or modern, are sentiments so majestic clothed in words and phrases so inadequate for their complete comprehension. The truth is that Greek was a foreign tongue to Paul, as it was to the other New Testament authors, so that when he attempted to write or dietate let-

Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians and

are particularly valuable, as being the only

however sublime, would be inevitably obscured by imperfect words and poorly constructed sentences. It is for this reason that the author of "Ancient Sacred Scriptures" holds that the translator of the Apostolic letters should not endeavor to give a literal rendering of them, but to convey their sense as faithfully as pos-

11. In "Renascent Christianity" the author takes up and answers categorically the questions which are likely to be addressed by rthodox Christians to representatives of the higher criticism. One often heard inquiry is: Are you not exposing yourself to the charge of 'heresy'?" The answer is: "There are no tiples one a which the author of "Ancient Sacred terrors in this charge, as it has been a familiar one to the author from college and theological Gespel narratives. His devout object was, he seminary days. 'After the way which they call heresy, so worshipped I the God of my fathers' for these thirty years past." Of a simliar kind is another objection frequently en-"Are you not reviving 'ancient heresies' which were long ago and repeatedly condemned?" The reply is: "Yes, but it is always in order to move a reconsideration. comes the inquiry. "Are you not disregarding the injunction of Jesus. 'Put not new wine into old bottles; sew not new cloth upon an old garment '?" The response made to this objection is: "Temporary expedients are always allowable, and sometimes advisable; till new bottles are made it is wise to tie up the old 'wine-sgins' as best one can; till the new garments are patterned and prepared it is needful to patch up the old. This, however, not as a finality, but only as a makeshift." In connection with this particular topic we are reminded that Jesus himself and his apostles used nearly all of the outworn forms, formularies and symbols of the Jews with entirely new meanings. For a good many years the orthodox party among the Christians, with their Judaizings as to circumcision, bloody sacrifices. priestly successions, temple-worship and other such "essentials" and "essential meanings. was overwhelmingly uppermost. St. Paul, for a time almost single-handed, battled with them throughout his life, insisting upon using the old forms, formularies and symbols in a new and rational way. After his death, successors in the Pauline spirit and methods multiplied and, finally, prevailed. Then, and not till then, was the new wine out into new bottles; the new garments were made out of new cloth. Much the same thing took place at the time of the Protestant Reformation, which the representatives of the higher criticism regard as only the beginning of the renaissance of Christianity. Two centuries before Luther, individual priests and saintly scholars began to use, and to insist upon using, old forms, formularles and symbols with meanings entirely new. Till Protestantism was a fact, organized and established, this rational use of irrational rituals, creeds and sacraments was persisted in by individuals; at length, the various corporate bodies of Protestantism were compelled to accept the rational meanings and adopt new forms of ritual creeds and sacraments appropriate to them. So has it been ever and everywhere in all classes of reforms Never is there an abrupt transit from the old o the new; the changes are gradual, first in the spirit, then in the letter. Not revolution but reform is the meaning of renascent Christianity; Christianity springing up into renewed life, and the renewed life in due time assuming its appropriate form: re-forming it self. This view of the matter helps our author to answer another question which is frequenty put to the upholders of a critical study of

the Bible: "Are you not inconsistent, nay,

guilty of a sort of hypocrisy in remaining offt

cially, or even nominally, connected with a re-

ligious body which, as regards the large ma-

ter, of its belief?" The answer is that "reform

comes never, except through the efforts of self-

consecrated, self-forgetting reformers, who

are inside the religious body that needs to be

reformed: and who insist upon the right to re-

We pass to another question which is often in the mouths of objectors to a critical study of

free speech are granted to them.

jority, adheres to the old spirit, as well as let-

the Bible: "Why not wait for councils tions or authorized committees of the great religious bodies to do the 'tving up' and the patching,' if these things so much need to be lone?" "By what authority doest thou these a well-known and highly venerated Ameri-can clergyman: "Always there is the same when you trust to priests and Levites, instead of leaving every man to testify for the truth. The priest goes on his side of the way on his decorous journey. The Levite goes on his. It is the outside Samaritan who listens to the untrustworthy. Similar opinions of it have been held by some modern theologians. The day or the Roman Catholic Church of the Dark Ages, or any of its little Protestant imitators, ever, holds that there is unquestionably a are all in the same condemnation. From the nature of the case they look backward and despise the word of prophecy. Most dangerous, as I believe, to liberty of conscience compact organization, where wealth and dignity and prestige combine to insist that Middle Age dogmas shall be clamped over the mouth f the creatures of to-day, men who been taught by Hamilton and Le Conte. Darwin and Agassiz, Morris and Robertson, Martineau and Stanley, Channing and Emerson." To which the author of Renascent Christianity" would add that in eligion, as elsewhere, individuals no less than corporations have rights, among which is the right of free conscience and free speech. For sixteen centuries the autocratic Church of suppress this right, but in enlightened days in enlightened lands ecclesiastical authorities can be no longer slave holders or stave drivers. "The word of God is not bound" any longer. The emancipation of thought and tongue has been proclaimed in Church as well as State. In remote and degraded communities and "communions," lave holders and slave drivers still resist : nay, there are many of the newly manumitted who hug their broken chains and, serf-like, dare not speak as the spirit seeketh to give them utterance. Notwithstanding, to all that are willing to be freemen, the declaration of spiritual independence is an accomplished fact.

We reproduce one more of the questions to which those who insist upon applying modern scholarship to the interpretation of the Bible are expected to reply: Why continue the use of such unscriptural terms as the Trinity and of such Apostolic formularies as the Nicene creed and of much of the larguage common to the written and exten poraneous devotions of orthodox Christians, the mediaval and modern meaning of which is so widely different from he beliefs entertained by the upholders of the higher criticism ! Why continue to employ the terms which imply belief that, as you insist, neither Jesus nor any of the spiritual and intelligent Christians of the first two centuries entertained? An answer is suggested by a well-known American physiclan, who, in a work on pathology, has de-fended himself for retaining ancient medical terms which have long ceased to cossess their original significance. "Nearly all our medical terminology expresses our ignorance more than our knowledge. Despite all our progress. n medical science, we are yet obliged to retain ld terms, which are very inadequate, for even our best known diseases. But, provided we understand what they mean now and to us, there is no serious objection to their use. Indeed, their retention is a matter of necesthe various diseases shall be unveiled; then these old and largely meaningless terms can be and will be gradually abandoned." Un illar grounds would the author of " Renascent Christianity" justify his employment of that such terms as the Trinity, such creeds as the Nicene, and such dogmatic or symbolic words as are widely used in orthodox instrucion as well as devotion express ignorance more than knowledge. "Despite our progress, however, we are yet obliged to retain them, inadequate as they are, to convey our higher meaning. As we seek not revolution but reform, we must retain them until not only our own knowledge, but also the knowledge of tom of writing or printing these appellations | ters in this strange language the thought, | those whom we are called upon to guide and in-

struct, is more complete. There is no serious objection to this, provided we understand, and also try to make those whom we guide and teach understand, what they mean now and to us. Under such conditions their retention is allowable, and perhaps indispensable, until such a time as the full meaning of theological

truth shall have been unveiled."

When did the notion of infallibility first attach itself to the Bible? The answers given to this and many another interesting question by the representatives of the higher criticism will be found set forth on pages 172-192 of "Ronascent Christianity." As regards the Old Testament, the idea of infallibility was first ssociated with the Pentateuch; that is to say, the five books attributed to Moses, or the Law. as it was called. For a long time the infailibility even of the Pentateuch seems to have been something very intangible and shadowy. Those parts of the Old Testament which were called by the Jews "The Prophets" came next to be so looked upon, while the parts then known as Hagiographs, or Chetubin, and including such books as the Psaims, the Proverbs and Job, which to-day are generally held in higher esteem than any other of the Old Testament books, did not come to be regarded as really sacred much before the time of Christ. Even at the time of Christ, all this section of the Old Testament was ranked much lower in authority or sacredness than the rest. As to the New Testament writings. the Epistles seem to have come to be deemed authoritative considerably earlier than the Gospels or the Acts. For a long time, at the very least two centuries, none of the New Testament writings was looked upon by the Christian Church as being equally sacred with the books of the Old Testament. Three or four centuries passed away before it was decided which particular compositions, out of a large number of writings produced within a century or two after the death of Jesus, should be in cluded in the New Testament canon. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of the Bible's

Infallibility, in the rigid sense now widely

known and taught, was unknown to the early hristian Church. Indeed, it did not come into existence until the middle of the sixteenth entury, not having been held originally by the earliest and greatest of the reformers. The Catholic Church has never adopted it. Even if we grant that the Bible was originally infallible or, in other words, that the books were written in such a marvelious way as to insure their infallible correctness at the time of the writing; if we grant, also, that all the books which have been excluded from the canon of the Old Testament and of the New are just the ones that ought to be excluded, and that all which have been included are just the ones that ought to be included, and that all which have been lost were spurious, so that the loss does not affect at all the perfection of the eanon—though we should grant all this, how far should we have got to the certainty that the Bible which we hold in our hands to-day is infallible-is, that is to say, infallible as it comes to us? In other words, grant that the stream as it began its course far back in Palestine twenty-two, or twenty, or eighteen, or sixteen centuries ago was infallible at its outset, what assurance have we that now, after a wandering and winding down through the dark maze of the ages, it is still infallible? After we have got the writings all infallibly written, and after we have got them all gathered together. just as they should be, into a canon or infallible collection, we have still got to devise a way to gather them together in modern times with out error or change. It is certain that, at the present day, translators, notwithstanding the help afforded by an extensive expository and critical apparatus, are very fallible beings. Were the translators of preceding ages, who translated Hebrew into Greek and Latin, and Greek and Latin into English, and Hebrew into English in connection with the Old and New Testament books, miraculously preserved from making errors? If so, what mean the many thousands of errors which the great ommission of English Scholars, invited some twenty years ago to make for us a new English version of the Bible, found in the curent version authorized by King James? It was pointed out at the time when the revised translation was published that, in the text of e New Testament alone, the whole number of various readings exceeds a hundred thou Some of these variations, it is true, are slight, and in no way affect the sense. Others again, are marked, and affect the sense materially. For example, the celebrated text concerning the three heavenly witnesses (John, L. 5, 7, 8; the text which for a thousand years has been the strongest scriptural bulwark of the doctrine of the Trinity, is now admitted on all hands to be an interpolation. What, then,

perfect in all the 2,000-years-long chain of preservation and transmission of the original writings down to us.

Among the recent American publications which exemplify the higher criticism of the Bible, we should not overlook the book enti-A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." by Dr. Arthur McGiffert, Professo of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, (Scribners.) It is evident that the author of this volume is thoroughly conversant with the work performed by German and Dutch scholars in the interpretation of the New Testament. His authorities are continually effed, either in the text or footnotes. We may say at once that, with reference to many controverted points, the author occupies a conservative position. He is, for example, in general

becomes of our infallible Bible? It has melted

away into thin air, if there be a single link im-

agreement with Prof. Harnack as to the chronology of St. Paul's life, the interpretation of the purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the general estimate of the pastoral epistles, the conviction that the second Epistle of Peter is really the only pseudonymous work in the ew Testament, and the recognition of the Book of Acts as based, in the main, on trust-worthy sources. We add that the aim of the work is positive and not negative, constructive and not destructive. This volume, although its purpose is to pre-

sent a history of Christianity in the apostolic age, contains necessarily much that falls properly within the province of special works upon New Testament literature, exegesis or theology. For, of course, the apostolic age includes the age of the New Testament, and in the pages of the latter are set forth the thoughts and deeds of the leading actors in the history. The first chapter is, accordingly devoted to an account of the origin of Christianity, after which the author discusses the primitive Jewish Christianity which preceded the work performed by Paul. It is the latter opic that constitutes the principal subject of the book. There are supplemental chapters lowever, which trace the history of the developing Church and examine the Christianity the Johannine writings and the radical Paulinism evolved by the Gnosties and other

The most characteristic feature of the first chapter is a paragraph in which Prof. McGiffert indicates what he deems the secret of the historical significance of Jesus. After pointing ut that Jesus the Christ has been though of almost from the beginning as the inearnation of the Delty, and as the perfect and ideal man, the author submits that, as a matter of fact, it was not upon His delty nor yet upon the perfection of His humanity that His disciples founded the Christian hurch. The men whom He gathered about Him regarded Him in neither of these aspects. They thought of Him only as the Messinh, and the fact that He left a church behind Him instead of a mere name, and that He is known to history as the founder of a religion and not as theological terminology. He would not deny a more sage or prophet, is historically due not so much to any uniqueness, either in character or in His nature, as to the conviction which he succeeded in imparting to His followers that he was the one who had been comised by the prophets and long awaited by the Father. The power of His personality is vealed by His success in impressing that belief upon them, in spite of the difficulties with which it was beset. He might have been, however, all that He was as a teacher, and as a

wonder worker, and yet have accomplished

not stepped into the place which had so long been waiting to be filled, and become the centre of the accumulated hopes and expecta-tions of centuries. The Gospel of the Fatherhood of God which He preached is eminently fitted to reform and beautify and save the lives of men, but the preaching of that Gospel would not itself have resulted in the Christian Church. Only the belief in Jesus's Messiahship could effect the great historic movement which bears, not His personal, but His official name. In his second chapter, Prof. McGiffert con

siders the effect upon Jesus's disciples of His

death and of the events that followed. It could

not be otherwise than that a change in their thinking and living should be wrought by such

occurrences. That change was momentous in

its consequences. There are many indications

followers of Jesus were looking forward to His

in our Gospels that, during His lifetime, the

speedy establishment of an earthly kingdom Even His announcement of His death does not seem to have changed their expectations in this regard. If they believed He could die they evidently believed, also, that His death would only usher in the consummation, and that he would immediately appear upon the clouds as the conquering Messiah to act up His kingdom upon earth and to assert His dominion over all peoples Even after His resurrection, the discipleseem still to have held for a time substantially the same iden. His death, unaccon panied as it was by convincing evidence of his Messiahship, had bewildered and distressed hem, but His reappearance had revived all heir old hopes in an unchanged form, and they expected now the immediate accomplishuent of that for which they had been so long ooking. The resurrection, they thought, must se for this and no other purpose. It was not for this purpose, however, and they speedily discovered the fact. Jesus reappeared, indeed, but it was only to leave them again and ascend to heaven. His departure, then, must mean one of two things: either their hopes were vain and the kingdom upon earth for which they had been looking was never to have an exist ence, or else the time for its establishment was not yet come. It was of the greatest historic moment that the disciples adopted not the former, but the latter alternative sources of our information show that they, and dmost the entire early Church after them, cor tinued to believe that an earthly kingdom was yet to be founded by the Christ. But, if the time for its establishment was postponed by Jesus's departure from the earth, it was evident that the work of preparation must go on. and thus there was thrust upon the disciples a new and unexpected duty. Upon them rested the responsibility of carrying on, until the onsummation, the work which Jesus had be-They felt themselves now called to take up the task which He had laid down; called to enterupon a new mission, which was not to ease until He returned in glory upon the ouds of heaven. Up to the time of Jesus's death they had been simply followers; now they were to be leaders. While He was with them they had simply to learn of Him, to atad Him, to be His faithful adherents, that they might be ready to share with Him in the glory of the coming kingdom. Now there fell them another task; they must seek to pre pare others for the consummation, as He had repared them; they must gather disciples into the kingdom as He had done; they must, if could, secure for Him the rence of the Jewish nation, which had reeted Him, in order that the naon as a whole might become the kingm of God. It was this sense of a new duty and responsibility that led the disciples who bal betaken themselves to Galilee back to Jerusalem The resolve to discharge this duty marks the real starting point in the history of the Church. That Christianity has had a history is due to the fact that the disciples did not return disheartened to their old pursuits and live on as if they had never known Jesus of Nazareth, but that, on the contrary, filled with the belief that their master still lived,

called "gift of tongues" which was bestowed upon the disciples upon the day of Pentecost, and which is commonly supposed to mean that they acquired the power of speaking foreign anguages which they had never learned This, indeed, is asserted by the author of the book of Acts (whether Luke or another who says that the persons present heard the disciples speaking in the languages severally native to the auditors. It has been suggested that the author's representations were se to a misunderstanding on his part of the then common phenomenon of the glossolalia. arising from the fact that he had, himself, never witnessed it. As, in two other passages of the Acis, however, the glossolalia is mentioned in the correct Pauline way, some other reason must be given for the misinter-pretation of the Pentecostal phenomenon. Prof. McGiffert opines that the reason may be ound in the glamour which surrounded the infant Church in the eyes of its historian, who was, himself, far removed from the events which he records. Under the circumstances he could hardly avoid investing familiar occur rences with marvel and mystery. At any rate whatever be the cause of his misunderstanding. it is certain that his conception of the phenomenon is borne out neither by Peter's speech referring to the same incident, nor by day. From various passages in the New Testament we learn that a peculiar gift, known a the "gift of tongues," was widely exercised in the Apostolic Church, and Prof. McGiffer, directs attention to the fourteenth chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians where in, as he thinks, the general nature of the gift is made plain. The term glossolalia, or gift of tongues, seems to have been applied to frenzied or ecstatic utterances unintelligible both to the speakers and the hearers, except such as might be endowed by the Holy Spirit with a especial capacity of interpretation. The speaker was supposed to be completely under the control of the Spirit, to be a mere passive instrument in its hands, and to be moved and played upon by it. He was not endowed with the power to speak in foreign languages; his words were divine, not human words, and had no relation whatever to any intelligible human tongue. It was not nnatural, therefore, that the speakers should ppear to unbelieving auditors to be demented intoxicated, as Paul implies was not infreuently the case. It is further pointed out that owhere in Peter's discourse, which constitutes our most trustworthy source of informaon concerning what actually occurred on the day of Pentecost, is there any reference to the ise of foreign languages by his fellow disciples, not even when he undertakes to defend them against the charge of drunkenness. Neither is there any hint in the New Testament writings hat the disciples ever made use in their missionary labors of their miraculous power to speak in foreign languages, alleged by the author of the Acts to have been conferred upon them on the day of Pentecost. In the same chapter on primitive Jewish

conscious of holding a commission from

Him, they banded themselves together with the

determination to complete His work and to

It is in the chanter on trimitive Jewish Chris-

anity that Prof Mediffert discusses the so-

prepare their countrymen for His return.

Christianity there is an attempt to explain how the followers of Jesus came to be called Chrisians. The author of the Acts reports that the disciples of Jesus were called Christians first Antioch. Tacitus, if we accept the authen icity of the passages, said that the Romans Nero, and some scholars have consequently hought that the name had its origin in Rome. But Lipsius has shown that the word Greek, not Latin, being formed after the analogy of proper adjectives in -anos, -innos, which were very commonly employed by the Greeks of Asia as party designa-The term might, therefore, easiy have originated in Antioch. McGiffert, however, does not de 4brot probable that it was first used by the disciplefor they called themselves commonly Analytics, or Hagior; nor is it likely that it was used by the Jews, for they could not have acknowledged the disciples of Jesus as followers of the Mes-

siah. The Jews commonly called them Naza-

little more than John the Baptist did had He renes, or the "Sect of the Nazarenes." The word Christian was doubtless first employed by the heathens, the word Christ being mistakenly understood by them not as a title but as a proper name. The invention of the word. if it was due to the heathen, implies that the Christians had already become more or sharply distinguished from the Jews, and that they were recognized as a separate, if not wholly independent, religious sect. That this should have been the case at an early day In Antioch is what we should expect if Luke's report of Gentile conversions there be accepted. Such unelreumelsed Gentile Christians could not become a part of the Jewish Church. It was, therefore, inevitable, as their numbers in-creased, that they should constitute, either alone or in company with such Jewish Christians as had thrown off the restraints of the Mosaic law, a community of their own, which had its religious life not within but without the which made the rise of the special name "Christian" possible, and it can hardly have

answer to this question Prof. Mediffert takes a middle ground between those who would exaggerate and those who would circumscribe the importance of Paul's work. Just what he complished is thus defined: Paul was not the founder of Christianity; he was only its greatest missionary. The Gentile Church, the Church of the world at large, owes its existence and its rapid strongth very largely to him; but hristlan Church, and there was room in it, as the event proved, for many other conceptions of Paul himself preached. Outside of Ebionitic treles his name was always held in high honor. but the Christianity of the world-church of the Galatians, Corinthians and Romans. does not mean that the teachings of Paul were entirely neglected or misunderstood. Some of those teachings are reproduced in many post-Pauline writings. Yet even where they are thus found they appear in nearly every case in proportions and in relations different from those in which they were originally uttered, and combined with other ideas entire-ly foreign to Paul's thought. Now one element, now another, of his teaching is seized upon by this or that Christian, and to it is given a prominent or even a controlling place in his system. but Paul's conception of Christianity is lost Almost no one looks upon the Gospel precisely as Paul looked, or reproduces his interpreta-

tion of it in its original proportions This remarkable lack of a genuine Paulinism in the writings of the early Christians is measure to the fact that Paul's teachings. which were largely the fruit of his own experience, were too profound to be appreciated by the mass of his converts, who possessed no such religious nature as he was endowed with, and who had passed through no such spiritual crisis as had preceded his conversion to the Christian faith. The absence of a true Paulinism is ascribed more largely to the fact that Paul was not the only missionary of the kind and that multitudes of Gentlie Christians received the Gospel from other lips than his. This was true of the Christians of Alexandria, a city which he never visited, and of Rome, where he spent the closing years of his life. It was true, also, of many provinces lying both east and west of his miss onary field, and even of many communities within the territory which he partially covered. Thus Pontus and Bithynia on the east, Gaul, Spain and North Africa on the west, were never visited by him, and even in the province of Asia, where he labored so long, Colosse, Laodicea and Hierapolis, had not seen his face. It even those who lowed their conversion directly to him proved commonly unable to apprehend the full nature and significance of his teachings, much less was it to be expected that those who knew him only by reputation, or those who heard him only after their own conceptions of Christianity were already formed and crystalized, should understand his Gospel and make it their own. Still less was this be looked for when the Gospei which they had ecived from others was commonly far more in line with their own previous thought and

experience, and thus far more easily comprehended and accepted. The Gospel which was brought to the Gentile world by other missionaries than Paul it is faithful and scrupulous writer will sometimes pronounced impossible to reconstruct in all its details; for the sources upon which we have to we should expose ourselves to the peril of depend for our knowledge of it are very limit- making the Holy spirit responsible for ed. Prof. McGiffert believes, however, that the grammar, for an incorrect use of words, for main substance of it can be reproduced with inelegant expressions and for a disorderly some degree of confidence. Upon one capital arrangement of materials; an offence which point all of the missionaries to the Gentiles were in agreement, both with each other and with Paul. Paul believed that the Gentile Christian is free from the obligation to observe the Jowish law. All the men that carried the Gospel to the heathen world were commonly agreed. moreover, that the Jewish Christian, as well as his Gentlie brother, is from such obligation. This principle needed more time than did the other to secure general recognition. In Jerusalem, long after the freedom of Gentile Christians had been admitted, the disciples of Jewish birth continued to observe their ancestral law in all its strictness and to insist upon the duty of all their Christian compatriots to do the same. There can be no doubt that there were at that time many Jewish Christians outside of Palestine who followed the same course. But there were many, also, and probably far more who believed in the abrogation of the national code for Jewish as well as Gentile disciples. Even before Paul entered upon his missionary career there were those who held this opinion and acted upon it in Antioch and elsewher quite independently of him. As time passed and Christianity spread rather more widely in the Roman world, and the Gentile contingent grew ever larger and more influential, the number of such Jewish liberals must have increased with great rapidity. It was inevitable, indeed, that those who still clung to the old forms and refused to meet their Gentile brethren on equal terms should find themselves in an ever more hopeless minority, and that the Church at large should go its way without seriously concerning themselves about them. Prof. McGiffert deems it a mistake to think that the question remained a burning one for any length of time. All the writings of the first century bear witness to the contrary. will not do to explain the lack of references the controversy touching the Mosaic law in the non-Pauline literature of that cen ury by assuming a desire on the part of the writers to rise above the differences that had agitated the Church and to construct a platform upon which both parties could stand. Such an assumption is discarded as groundless in the book before us. The truth is declared to be that there was no serious dispute at the time when that literature was written, and that the conroversy had never been so widespread as to impress its memory upon the Church at large. That Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, were entirely free from the obligation to observe the law of Moses simply went without saying in most parts of Christendom even before the time of Paul's death. There was no reason whatever for a Christian writer to spend either time or thought upon a question that concerned neither himself nor his brethren.

Now let us recur to the fundamental question, how far do these and other representa-tives of the higher criticism consider that their dows impair the credibility of the Bible? We shall let them reply, and, so far as this may be practicable, in their own words.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned. the theory that the vowel points and accents were original and inspired has been so utterly disproved that no Biblical scholar of the present day would venture to defend Lacking this support, however, how can e theory of verbal inspiration stand? Looking at the dectrine of verbal inspiration from the comparatively humble viewpoint of merely textual criticism, we must recognize that there can be no inspiration of the written letters or uttered sounds of the honest judgments

consonants are transliterations of the original Hebrew letters, which have been lost, and the yowel sounds are traditional and in many respects artificial and uncertain. While there is a general correspondence of these letters and sounds, so that they give substantially the original, they do not give exactly the original. The inspiration must, therefore, lie back of the written letters and the uttered sounds, and be sought in that which is common alike to the old characters and the new, alike to the utterance of the voice and the construction of the pen, namely, in the concepts, the sense and meaning that they convey. So much for the asserted bearing of even textual criticism upon the theory of plenary and verbal inspiration. Now, for what advanced Biblical scholars declare to be the effect of the higher criticism upon the credibility of Scripture. That there are errors and inconsistencies in the pres-Jewish synagogue. So soon as this state of ent texts of our Bible it is vain to deny. No-affairs existed, the conditions were present body denies it. It is not denied by those who insist upon the pienary inspiration of the original autographs, which we do not possess, and een very long before the unne was coined.

What did Paul do for Christianity? In his cal, geographical and other circumstantial miscannot hope to secure. There are chronologitakes. Such circumstantial and incidental errors, however, as arise from inadvertence or lack of information on the part of an auther are not an impeachment of his credibility. If we would distinguish between revelation and inspiration, and yet insist upon ascribing absolute inerrancy to the latter as well as to the former, we virtually do away with any distinction between the it was by no means a Pauline Church; it was a terms. No mere man can escape human errors, unless divine revelation shall set even the most familiar things in a new and infallible the Gospel than the particular conception which | light, and also so control him that he cannot make a slip of the eye or the hand or commit a fault in the imagination, in conception, in rea-soning, in rhetorical figure or in grammatical the second and subsequent centuries has little | expression; and, indeed, so raise him above likeness to the Christianity of the epistles to his fellows, contemporary and posterior, that he This | shall see through all their errors in science and philosophy as well as in theology, and anticipate the discoveries to be made in all branches of knowledge by thousands of years. Errors of inadvertence in minor details, where the author's position and character are well known. do not destroy his credibility as a witness in any literature or any court of justice. It is not, then, to be presumed that divine inspiration lifted the author above his age any more than was necessary to convey divine instruction with infallible certainty to mankind. We have to take into account the extent of the author's human knowledge, his point of view and type of thought, his methods of reasoning and tilustration. The substance of the teachings concoved may be infallible, while, at the same time the manner in which it is transmitted by the human intermediary may be open to criticism. Now the higher criticism distinguishes between the divine substance and the literary phenomena which constitute the human metium. It recognizes faults of grammar, of rhetoric and logic in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. The authors of the Old Testament used the language with which they were familiar; some of them classic Hebrew, others of them dialectic and corrupted Hebrew. Some of them have a good prose style; others of them have a dull, tedious, pedantic style. Some of them are poets of the highest rank; others of them write such inferior poetry that one is surprised that they did not use prose. Some of them reason clearly, profoundly and convincingly; others of them reason in a loose, obscure and unconvincing manner. Some of them present truths like intuitions of light; others labor with them, and, eventually, deliver them in erude and undeveloped form. The results of he study of them show that, in all these respects, the Biblical authors were left to themselves, to their own individualities or idiosynerasies. All these matters belong to the manner and method of imparting instruction Errors in these formal things do not impair the infallibility of the substance, the religious

present Hebrew texts; for the present writte

They were men of God, and, if we may judge from the results of their work, they were guided by the Divine Spirit in their apprehension and expression of the divina teaching. But, also, if we may judge from their ork, it seems most probable that they were not guided by the Divine Spirit in their grammar, in their rhetoric, in their logic, in their arangement of their materials, or in their general editorial work. In all these matters they were left to their own judgment and were suffered to commit such errors as even the most venteenth century by their earliest op-

seventeenth century by their earliest opponents.

The assumption of literal inspiration is not
needed for faith in the great truths of Christianity, as was pointed out in Riskl by Richard Baxter in a memorable passage quoted
in one of the books here reviewed: Hero
I must tell you a great and needful truth,
which Christians, fearing to confess, do, by
everdoing, tempt men to inidelity. The
Seripture is like a man's body, where some
parts are but for the preservation of the rest,
and may be maimed without dealt. The sense
as the soul of the Seripture and the letters but
the body or valuede. The document of the
Creed, Lord's Prayer and becalogue, Bantism and the Lerd's Supper is the vital
part and Christianity itself. The Old Testament letter (written as we have it about
Exta's time) is that vehicle, as the revelution of those times was But as after Christ
incarnation and assension the Spirit was more
abundantly given, and the revelation more
reflect and scaled, so the doctrine is more
holy, and the vehicle and body, that is, the
words, are less imperfect and more sure to us.
So that he that doubteth the truth of some
words are less imperfect and more sure to us.
So that he that doubteth the truth of some
words in the Old Testament, or of some ejrcumstances in the New, has no reason, therefore, to doubt of the Christian religion, whereof
these writings are but the vehicle or be 2y,
sufficient to ascertain us of the truth of the
history and doctrine.

When and how, then, does the higher critieism come into conflict with the authority of
eism come into conflict with the authority of

counstances in the New, has no reason, therefore, to doubt of the Christian rehigher, whereof those writings are but the vehicle or to be sufficient to assertain us of the truth of the history and deerine. When and heav, then, does the higher criticism come into conflict if it found that the deerinal statements of Scripture are not authoritative and that its revelations as to truths of supreme importance are noteredible. If the credibility of a book, considered as a whole, is impenched, its divine authority and inspiration are impeached by the substance of a book, considered as a whole, is impenched, its divine authority and inspiration are impeached by the substance of a book, considered as a whole, however, something more most be adduced than errors in matters of dental that do not affect the author's scope of argument or his religious teachings. As a matter of fact, the advocates of the higher criticism maintain that it has strengthened rather than weakened the rendibility of Scripture. It has studied the human features of the Libba and brought out the variety of form and coiler assumed by the divine revelution. Many of the substance of inconsistencies have been found to be different modes of representing the same thing, complementary to one another, and combining to give a fuller representation than any one mode of pertruture could have given as the two sides of a sterosserop give a representation as the two sides of a sterosserop give a representation of the minist of such diversity of form and coloris pronounced much more convincing than would be such a unity of more coincidence as the older hormonists sought to obtain by stretching and straining the Scripture on the most step of their hair splitting scholarstics have been found to a representation in cach of which tied condessended to the weak-ness and the ignorance of their hair-splitting scholarstics have been found to approach the people of tood in different ages and inconsistencies have been found to approach the people of tood in different ages and